Saskatchewan
Ministry of
Justice and
Attorney General

# Review of the Circumstances Surrounding the Improper Release of an Inmate From the Regina Correctional Centre while making an Appearance at the Court of Queen's Bench, October 22nd, 2008

Government of Saskatchewan

# Memorandum

From Deputy Minister of Justice
and Deputy Attorney General

Date November 20, 2008

Phone 787-5351

To Garnet Garven
Deputy Minister to the Premier

Your File

Our File

Re **Improper Release from Court of Queen's Bench**

On October 24, 2008, you asked me to conduct an investigation of the improper release from custody of a Regina Provincial Correctional Centre inmate from the Court of Queen's Bench in Regina on October 22, 2008. You provided the following Terms of Reference for my investigation:

"To assist the Government of Saskatchewan in the management of its public safety goals, I would ask that you conduct a review of the above referenced incident. In conducting your review, I would ask that you pay specific attention to the following:

1. the circumstances surrounding the improper release of [the inmate], and the actions taken by officials in the Ministry thereafter, including:
   a. what are the factual circumstances which led to [the inmate's] release?
   b. how was the error discovered?
   c. once it was determined that his release was improper, what actions were taken by officials in response and when were those actions taken?
2. what were the applicable practices, policies and procedures in place at the time of the improper release governing the actions to be taken by officials in response to these types of incidents and were those practices, policies and procedures followed?
3. as a result of your findings, should changes to existing Ministry practices, policies and procedures be considered to ensure that inappropriate release incidents are minimized, that officials respond appropriately to them and that timely public notification is provided?

Please report to me on your findings as well as any recommendations that you may have to prevent similar incidents in the future and ensure proper public notification. You are free to conduct your review in any manner you consider appropriate and to make comments and recommendations on these matters and any other matters which you consider relevant to achieving the purposes of this review."

I have the privilege of submitting my investigation report pursuant to your request.

Doug Moen, Q.C.
Deputy Minister of Justice
and Attorney General

Acid-free Paper

# INVESTIGATION REPORT

## IMPROPER RELEASE OF REGINA PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE INMATE FROM THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
## October 22, 2008

### Facts

On October 22nd, 2008, an inmate appeared before the Court of Queen's Bench on robbery-related charges. The Judge acquitted the inmate of all charges that were in front of her that day.

Prior to his appearance in court, the inmate was being held in custody on remand at the Regina Provincial Correctional Centre (RPCC). The inmate's appearance in court that morning ended at approximately 9:10 a.m. He was then returned to cells at the Court of Queen's Bench.

At approximately 9:15 a.m., a provost officer with the RCMP (the provost officer), was responsible for dealing with the inmate. The duties of a provost officer are to transport prisoners and accused from correctional centres to court and, depending upon the result of court proceedings, to transport them back to the centre. As the inmate had been acquitted of his charges that day, the provost officer was not sure whether there were any additional charges outstanding against the inmate. He phoned the RPCC and talked to an admitting officer (the admitting officer) and asked if there were any other "holds" against the inmate. Following a review of the paper record that he had at the admitting office, the admitting officer advised that there were no other charges on which to hold the inmate. At about 9:25 a.m., the provost officer escorted the inmate to the main level of the Court of Queen's Bench and released him.

According to the admitting officer, within 10 to 15 minutes of giving the advice that he gave to the provost officer, the admitting officer reviewed the electronic record of the inmate and realized that there was a robbery charge originating in Prince Albert. The admitting officer advised his supervisor (the admission supervisor) of his error. The admitting officer phoned a clerk at the Court of Queen's Bench to confirm the charges involved, and then asked if the inmate was still in custody and if the provost officer had left the building. At about 9:50 a.m., the admitting officer contacted the provost officer by phone asking if he still had the inmate in custody as he was still remanded to custody in Prince Albert. The provost officer said that the inmate had been released, but that the inmate might go back to the RPCC to retrieve his belongings. The admitting officer then contacted a property officer at the RPCC at approximately 10:45 a.m. to request that if the inmate returned for his belongings, that he not be allowed to leave as there was a remand warrant for him.

At about 12 noon, the admission supervisor went upstairs to inform the Deputy Director of Operations of the incident. The Deputy Director was out for lunch. The admission supervisor was advised that the Director of the facility was in the building but not in his

office. The admission supervisor does not appear to have left a message or made any additional effort to contact a superior. He then returned to the admitting office working in close proximity to the admitting officer. Both men talk about this day as being hectic. A new staff member was being trained, the court runs were heavy and they were having problems operating some of the equipment in the new correctional facility.

Somewhere between 3 and 3:30 p.m., the admission supervisor leaves his shift to go home. He reports that he mentions the incident to the admitting officer, who he says replied "Don't worry, I've got it handled." He indicates that after working with the admitting officer for approximately 10 years, he trusted and relied upon him, as he had never been let down in the past.

At 6:11 p.m., the admitting officer placed an unlawfully at large (UAL) advisory on the Corrections Management Information System (CMIS), the electronic system used by correctional facilities. This appears to be the first time he addresses the file in the afternoon. He explains that he was incredibly busy during the course of the day. There was also the possibility that the inmate would return to retrieve his belongings, which did not in fact occur. Earlier in the day, he had prepared a package of material to be faxed to the RCMP. At around 7 p.m. he leaves for the day without sending that material to the RCMP. He describes that failure as a mental lapse on his part.

At 7:30 a.m. the next day (October 23rd), the admitting officer returns to work and reports that "I noticed the package had not been faxed out and immediately sent it out." At 7:45 a.m., an official at Head Office was going over the CMIS logs and noticed that the admitting officer had declared the inmate unlawfully at large. The Head Office official advised his supervisor of the incident and was told to gather more information. At 8:15 a.m., the Head Office official phoned the admitting officer to get clarification and asked him to complete an incident report. The admitting officer completed the incident report (Appendix 1) at 8:52 a.m. The Head Office official then called back approximately 20 minutes later and told the admitting officer to fax the unlawfully at large package on the inmate to the RCMP. The admitting officer actually did that at 10:43 a.m. However, the RCMP detachment officers did not pick up this fax until approximately 4 p.m. that day.

Senior staff at RPCC were not advised of the incident by the admitting office. They became aware of the incident as a result of an email from Head Office at around 11:30 a.m.

At approximately 10 a.m., the official from Head Office responsible for correctional facility operations (the provincial director) was made aware of the incident. The provincial director believed the Deputy Minister and Minister of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing (CPSP) would want to be made aware of the incident. A brief email was sent to the Deputy Minister at 10:26 a.m. (Appendix 2) advising of the incident and indicating that a briefing note would follow with more detail. At 10:29 a.m., the Deputy Minister wrote back to say "thanks". At that point, the Deputy Minister was in the office of the Minister of CPSP assisting with Question Period. A briefing note was sent by

email to the Deputy Minister at 11:00 a.m. (Appendix 3). The Deputy Minister leaves the legislature around 11:15 a.m. to return to his office.

The Deputy Minister advises that he did not fully read the email until approximately 11:45 a.m. Once he read the email, he believed he needed clarification and additional information before advising the Minister's Office. The Deputy Minister did not see a reason to immediately advise the Minister's Office because the situation did not directly fit the criteria established in the "Prison Break" policy of August 26th, 2008, approved by Executive Council and the Minister's Office. The policy is set out as follows:

*Prison "Breaks"*

*Effective immediately, we will ensure all media outlets plus the Deputy Minister, Chief of Staff to the Minister, and Minister are aware of a 'break' regardless of character as soon as possible.*

*Ideally, this will be within one hour. The public release can be brief advising that:*

- *"x" inmates have escaped;*
- *indicate whether inmate(s) are considered/not considered dangerous;*
- *the matter is being investigated by police;*
- *more information is to follow as it becomes available, etc.*

The Deputy Minister had other matters which he had to deal with when he returned to the office. Accordingly, he arranged to meet with officials of CPSP on this and other issues at 2 p.m. At the end of that meeting the Deputy Minister asked one of his officials to contact the Minister's Office to advise of the incident. That contact was made at approximately 3:20 p.m. The Minister was advised at approximately 4 p.m.

The Deputy Minister was called to the Minister's Office shortly thereafter. The Minister was concerned about why he had not been advised of the incident sooner.

In his statement, the Deputy Minister states that "In hindsight, of course, I could/should have advised the Minister's Office earlier and I naturally accept responsibility for that. However, as stated above, given I knew based on previous experiences that more questions would be asked by the Minister, I took steps to get more information before I asked [the Director of Communications] to call the Chief of Staff."

That evening the Deputy Minister decided to suspend two CPSP employees with pay while a full investigation of the incident was undertaken. The next morning the Minister of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing spoke to the press about the incident and raised concerns about the Ministry and about the Deputy Minister of CPSP. At about 4 p.m., the Deputy Minister was advised that he was suspended with pay pending the outcome of this review.

**Analysis**

The admitting office of RPCC was a hectic place on October 22nd, as it is most days. There was a very steady flow of prisoners between that facility and the court system. The admitting office had just moved into the new correctional center and there were many challenges with implementation. The employees would describe the workload as heavy. Management would agree that workload is significant and a great deal of precision is required. They would also say that it is possible to stop work to correct and deal with an error – the only impact is to delay other work in the queue. Management and employees at RPCC agree that an event of this kind is very rare and it would be viewed as quite serious.

It is clear that the admitting officer provided incorrect information to the provost officer and that this resulted in the release of the inmate. The admitting officer suggests that the provost officer also bears some responsibility for this situation. He claims documentation had been given to the provost officer by RPCC when the inmate left the facility indicating that the inmate had another charge for which he was remanded, and that he should be returned to the facility regardless of the result of court that day. CPSP officials produced sample copies of such documentation for this review, which substantiates the admitting officer's claim. However, there was no copy of what was actually provided to the provost officer. That material was disposed of by the provost officer after the inmate was released. The provost officer cannot recall if the documentation contained any information regarding the return of the inmate.

However, the admitting officer also acknowledged that when he took the call from the provost officer, he bore the responsibility for handling the file properly. His mistake in providing the wrong information is human error. It is going to happen in a busy work environment and I am advised that it happens rarely.

The admitting officer advised the admission supervisor of the incident. He called the court house and then the provost officer. He learned that the inmate had been released but that he might return to RPCC for his belongings. The admitting officer called the property office and asked them to hold the inmate if he arrived. All of this is appropriate and occurs before 11 a.m.

What happened then is more troubling. The admission supervisor took the responsibility to advise his superiors, but neither was present. He did not leave a message or return to advise them later. He did not provide an email message when he returned to his workstation. He did not attempt to contact them by phone. They do not learn of the incident until the next day – hearing this for the first time from Head Office staff. The admission supervisor clearly had a responsibility to ensure that this incident was reported to his superiors pursuant to the policy on "Reporting of Serious Incidents in Correctional Facilities" and the RPCC "Standing Order on Information Sharing" (Appendix 4 and 5). For some reason, the admission supervisor is of the view that his responsibility was met when, as he left the facility at approximately 3:30 p.m., he received an assurance that the

admitting officer would deal with it. However, once he knew of the incident he had a responsibility to move this information up the hierarchy and he failed to do so.

The admitting officer's response was also insufficient. He did not send out a UAL notification until around 6 p.m. that day. That notice was placed on CMIS – it did not go to the RCMP. He prepared material to be sent to the RCMP, but he neglected to send it out that day. He only sent it out the next morning after being prodded to do so by Head Office. This is not appropriate practice. He attributes the hectic working environment as the excuse for these departures from appropriate practice. He seemed to be relying on the possibility that the inmate might return voluntarily to collect his belongings.

Both employees are described by corrections staff as dedicated and hard working. Their knowledge of the process and procedures in the admitting area is viewed as invaluable. They operate the admitting area efficiently, despite high volume of work, short timelines, and numerous interruptions usually by phone calls.

I am concerned that the fax to the RCMP sat unread for about five hours. The RCMP should have been phoned regarding the fax, particularly given the length of time it had already taken to have the material sent to the RCMP. Discussions need to occur with the RCMP to rectify that situation. Further discussion with the RCMP is also required to determine whether, when provost officers learn of an UAL from contact with corrections facility staff, notification should also occur inside the RCMP detachment by the provost officer.

The information needed to determine a prisoner's status after being released by a court is maintained on CMIS. However, neither the RCMP provost officers, nor the Sheriffs in provincial court have access to the CMIS system. Accordingly, it is not possible for provost officers or Sheriffs to check the CMIS system to determine a prisoner's status. Therefore, they call the correctional center. This creates additional work for already busy admitting areas in those facilities and chances for error in situations where CMIS is not quickly accessible to admitting staff. In the short term, consideration should be given as to whether some form of access to CMIS can be provided to these groups. In the longer term, consideration should be given to an electronic system which integrates information management in the court and correctional systems. This would result in better communication between courts and corrections, a single record for a prisoner at all stages in the system and less duplication of effort.

Additionally, the continued implementation of video court proceedings in all adult secure custody facilities in the province could assist in preventing future incidents. Video court proceedings permit a prisoner to appear in court by way of closed circuit camera without physically leaving the facility. Aside from addressing issues of improper release, video court reduces the need for transporting prisoners to court and back to the facility thereby preventing potential for escape and reducing costs. Video court has been successfully implemented in Saskatoon and some remote areas of the province, and is expected to be implemented soon at RPCC.

Once Head Office became aware of the situation on the morning of October 23rd, the response from Head Office staff was timely. The appropriate notifications occurred.

The key issue to examine on October 23rd involves the actions of the Deputy Minister and the time he took to advise his Minister of the incident. The Deputy Minister acknowledges that he could and should have advised the Minister's Office earlier and accepts responsibility. It is clear that there was a heightened tension following the prison break in August which lead to the establishment of the policy of timely notification of the Minister, the Chief of Staff and the media. It is also clear that the incident did not directly fit within that policy – it was not a prison break. Yet it had some obvious similarities and the Minister had expectations of timely notification of incidents.

From interviews with staff, all knew there was a heightened concern and believed that the Minister needed to be advised. The question is how quickly was that required.

In looking at the Deputy Minister's actions, while they could have been more timely, they are understandable. He received the email at approximately 10:30 a.m. but did not fully read it until approximately 11:45 a.m. He felt he needed further information. He did not meet with staff immediately because he had other matters he had to deal with. He requested that staff be available at 2 p.m. He asked for additional information and, following the meeting, he directed staff to advise the Minister's office which occurred at 3:15 p.m. Could he have moved more quickly – yes. Were his actions unreasonable – no – particularly when one considers that getting the correct information is important under the circumstances. He did not have a comfort level with providing the information until after the 2:00 p.m. discussion.

In retrospect, it may have been a wiser move for the Deputy Minister to provide some preliminary information to the Minister at an earlier point given the Minister's expectation for timely notification. The Deputy Minister made an assessment that he needed additional facts prior to informing the Minister. This was, in the mind of the Deputy Minister, done for good reason and, on the face of it, was not unreasonable in the circumstances.

On balance, I would recommend that the suspension be lifted and that the Deputy Minister continue in his role as a Deputy Minister.

**What were the applicable practices, policies and procedures in place at the time of the improper release governing the actions to be taken by officials in response to these types of incidents and were those practices, policies and procedures followed?**

At RPCC, there were certainly practices between admitting staff and the RCMP provost officer relating to provision of information. It is not an unusual practice for the provost officer to phone the admitting staff to determine whether a person must be returned. There was also a well established practice at the RPCC admitting office of providing written documentation to the provost officer in charge of the inmate at the time the

inmate leaves the facility, which documentation includes information about whether the inmate is required to be returned.

In this case, it appears those practices were followed. The provost officer likely had documentation specifying that the inmate needed to be returned to RPCC following the court appearance. But once the inmate was acquitted of the charges, the provost officer felt he needed to call and check to see if the inmate needed to be returned. He called the admitting office of the RPCC for that information as per the common practice and received incorrect information, leading to the release of the inmate. The problem here was not so much the lack of a practice or procedure but of human error in not properly reviewing the documentation – both by the provost officer and the admitting officer.

The improper release of the inmate constitutes a serious incident in a correctional facility. As such, two existing policies applied to this situation:

1. Divisional Directive Security Policy 0012 entitled "Reporting of Serious Incidents in Correctional Facilities" (the Serious Incident Policy). This is a Ministry policy applicable to all correctional facilities in the province; and
2. The "Standing Order on Information Sharing" (the Information Sharing Policy) which is specifically applicable to the RPCC.

These two policies require the timely reporting of serious incidents by staff to supervisors.

According to the Serious Incident Policy, every correctional center is to have local procedures to ensure the reporting of serious incidents to the on-call facility manager. Once reported, the correctional facility Director is to ensure that the Executive Director of Adult Corrections located in Head Office is notified of the incident as soon as reasonably practical.

The Information Sharing Policy creates the local procedures referred to in the Serious Incident Policy to ensure that serious incidents in the facility are reported. Under the Information Sharing Policy, it is the responsibility of every staff member to report verbally to the shift/area supervisor any incident or information of note and record that information in an Incident Log Report as soon as possible, and before leaving the facility. Incidents are to be reported immediately to the supervising Assistant Deputy Director.

The actions of the admission supervisor do not meet the standard for reporting this incident in a timely way to his supervisors. In fact, he did not report it at all. He was aware of the incident before 10 a.m. but took no action to report the matter until approximately noon that day. When he did attempt to report, finding no supervisor present he left no request with support staff to have supervisors contact him, nor did he attempt to report at any other time or through phone or email. He had a significant responsibility to report once he was aware of the incident and in my view he failed to meet the requirements of the Policies.

The admitting officer met one requirement of the Information Sharing Policy by immediately advising his admission supervisor of the incident. However, he also had an obligation to prepare an Incident Log Report as soon as possible and, in any event, before he left the facility. This he did not do. The Incident Log report would have alerted facility management to the issue. While the admitting officer did prepare an Unlawfully at Large notice on the CMIS, that notice was not prepared until some eight hours following the event and the information package necessary to apprise the RCMP of the inmate's UAL status was not sent out until over 24 hours following the event. This is a serious departure from expected performance. Accordingly, in my view, his actions did not meet the requirement set by the Policies or the standards of performance that would be expected of personnel in the circumstance.

The Serious Incident Policy also provides that all serious incidents are to be reported to the Deputy Minister and the Minister through the Executive Director of Adult Corrections. In terms of how Head Office staff handled this matter, in my view the requirements of the Policy were met. There is obviously a question whether the Deputy Minister should have advised the Minister sooner, but as I have stated earlier in this report, my view is that his actions were not unreasonable.

**As a result of your findings, should changes to existing Ministry practices, policies and procedures be considered to ensure that inappropriate release incidents are minimized, that officials respond appropriately to them and that timely public notification is provided?**

I would make the following recommendations for changes in practices, policies and procedures:

1. A clear set of written procedures should be adopted with respect to the documentation and information exchanged between admitting staff and RCMP provost/Justice Ministry Sheriffs, and those officials should be trained in the use of those procedures. If an inmate is returnable regardless of the court ruling, there should be a very clear "flag" on the documentation provided to the escorting personnel as the inmate leaves any correctional centre. That "flag" should also be present on the file which remains with the admitting office file. Any documentation provided to escorting personnel should be retained on the file of the escorting office.

2. A review of Divisional Directives and Standing Orders involving admitting operations and procedures should be considered to determine if there are benefits to developing policies which are consistent throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

3. Staffing was a concern to the admitting staff. A review of staffing levels at the RPCC should be undertaken to ensure that adequate staffing exists.

4. Correctional centre management should make certain that employees are aware of their responsibilities to report serious incidents to their supervisors. A review of Divisional Security 0012 – "Reporting of Serious Incidents in Correctional Facilities" should be undertaken to ensure that it appropriately addresses all incidents to be reported and that local procedures are in place to ensure timely reporting.

5. Changes in technology should be considered to assist in preventing incidents of this type. Specifically:

    a. consideration should be given as to whether RCMP provost officers and Justice Ministry Sheriffs should have some form of access to the CMIS information system at all court locations;
    b. consideration should be given to implementing an electronic system which integrates information management in the court and correctional systems; and
    c. use of the video court system should be expanded throughout all adult secure custody facilities in the province.

6. Admitting office staff should be given a direction that when an inmate is found to be unlawfully at large, a UAL notification will be done immediately, the applicable police service will be advised by telephone, and the UAL package will be provided to that police service and to Head Office as soon as possible.

7. With respect to notifications of escapes and other serious incidents from adult secure custody facilities, subject to my comments below, a media advisory should be issued where an inmate has escaped, been released in error, or where the inmate is unlawfully at large for any reason if the inmate poses a threat to public safety. I recommend that the police should be consulted before that advisory is issued to ensure there are no concerns about such an advisory interfering with a police investigation, the apprehension of an individual, or the safety of a person. For example, in situations where a known person is vulnerable (perhaps a witness who provided evidence against an inmate or a spouse who has been assaulted by the inmate) notification of those persons most at risk should be attempted first. If such a situation exists, those concerns should be weighed against the need to ensure the safety of the public is protected and a decision be made by the Deputy Minister as to whether an advisory should be issued. Appendix 6 provides a recommended protocol outlining procedures to advise the Minister, and the public, where appropriate, in a time sensitive manner of threats to public safety resulting from adult and youth inmates escaping custody, being released in error or being otherwise unlawfully at large. I anticipate that these protocol recommendations will become part of a protocol dealing with a broad range of incident reporting for Correctional Centres.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this case began with a relatively simple human error that had the effect of improperly releasing an inmate from custody. It is a rare event, but nonetheless concerning. The real difficulty came in the delays in reporting the matter to supervisors and to the police. The employees involved are well intentioned, hardworking, and have received commendations for their past service. Any disciplinary steps to be taken with any CPSP employees as a result of this incident will be the responsibility of the Deputy Minister of CPSP.

Finally, I would recommend that the suspension be lifted and that the Deputy Minister continue in his role as a Deputy Minister.

# Appendix 1

07-Nov-2008 13:57 LOG DETAIL REPORT Page: 1

| Log Date/Time | Log Type | Sub Type | Institution |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23-Oct-2008 08:42 | Incident | General Incident | REGINA CORR CENTRE |

OBSERVATION/INCIDENT REPORT

AREA/UNIT:ADMITTING

TYPE OF INCIDENT:MISTAKEN IN RELEASING INMATE FROM QUEENS BENCH COURT

STAFF:[redacted]---- CW1 ADMITTING

INMATES:[redacted]

OTHER:[redacted] RCMP PROVOST

WHAT TOOK PLACE:CST [redacted] PHONED FROM QB COURT ASKING IF [redacted] GOT AQU ITTED ON HIS ROBBERY CHARGE ETC WAS HE FREE TO GO ? AT A QUICK GLANCE AT THE IT APPEARED THAT THAT WAS ALL HE WAS BEING HELD ON REMAND HERE, SO I STATED YES HE WAS FREE TO GO, UPON CLOSER LOOK AT HIS FILE & ADDITIONAL REPORTS I NOTED THAT THERE WAS AN ADDITIONAL REMAND THAT WAS A DIFFERENT INFO # SO I CONTACTED THE COURT CLERK TO CONFIRM INFO #'S, AS WELL CONTACTED [redacted] TO CONFIRM RELEASE & STATED AN ERROR HAD BEEN MADE & IF HE FOUND [redacted] TO P LEASE RETURN HIM TO THIS CENTRE BY HE STATED THAT [redacted] WAS GOING TO COME OUT TO THIS CENTRE TO RETRIEVE HIS PERSONNAL CLOTHING ETC. I NOTIFIED OUR PR OPERTY PERSON THAT IF THIS SHOULD HAPPEN THAT [redacted] WAS TO BE DETAINED. WE HELD OFF DECLAIRING HIM UAL UNTIL AFTER 1800 HRS TO GIVE HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK INTO OUR CUSTODY

ACTION TAKEN: [redacted] PLACED UAL FROM COURT HOUSE IN ERROR,THIS REPORT

[redacted]--- CW1 ADMITTING DEPT_____ 23-OCT-2008_____
(TYPE STAFF NAME) SIGNATURE DATE

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

# Appendix 2

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Coleman, Terry CPSP
**Sent:** Thursday, October 23, 2008 10:29 AM
**To:** Kirkland, Tammy CPSP; [redacted]
**Cc:** [redacted]
**Subject:** Re: error in release of remand offender

Thanks

TGC

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail was intended for a specific recipient. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. Any privilege that exists is not waived. If you are not the intended recipient, do not distribute it to another person or use it for any other purpose. Please delete it and advise me by return e-mail or telephone.

Thank you

---

**From:** Kirkland, Tammy CPSP
**To:** Coleman, Terry CPSP; [redacted]
**Cc:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Thu Oct 23 10:26:34 2008
**Subject:** error in release of remand offender

A remand offender at RPCC was released in error from Queen's Bench courthouse yesterday afternoon due to an error in information provided by RPCC admitting staff. The offender has an outstanding Robbery charge in Prince Albert. The police and court were notified as soon as the error was discovered however the offender had already been released from the courthouse. The offender is declared Unlawfully at Large. A briefing note will be up in the next 30 minutes.

Tammy Kirkland, Executive Director

10/27/2009

# Appendix 3

CORRECTIONS, PUBLIC SAFETY AND POLICING
BRIEFING NOTE

ISSUE: A Regina Provincial Correctional Centre (RPCC) Offender was Released from Queens Bench Courthouse Prior to Expiration of Remand Warrants

KEY MESSAGES:

- **A remanded inmate from the Regina Provincial Correctional Centre was released in error on Wednesday, October 22, 2008.**
- **Incidents of releases in error are subject to review by the Ministry to determine the circumstances of the incident and to determine what preventative measures may be required.**
- **RCMP were advised of the error and were instructed to apprehend the offender on the strength of his outstanding remand warrant.**

BACKGROUND:

- [redacted] was released in error from Queens Bench Court at approximately 11:00 a.m. on October 22, 2008.
- [redacted] with an outstanding Robbery remand charge. He appeared at court on October 22, 2008 on a Robbery charge and received no further sentence at Regina Queens Bench. He does however have an outstanding Robbery charge in Prince Albert with a next court appearance of December 19, 2008.
- Queens Bench court does not have access to the Corrections Management Information System, a phone call from RCMP Provost members to the Admitting Department at RPCC is the common practice to ascertain further hold warrants
- Admitting staff informed RCMP Provost that it did not appear as if there were any further holds and the matters of the day were concluded. After realizing inaccurate information was received, Admitting staff contacted the courthouse, as well as RCMP Provost, to ascertain if the offender was still in custody. RCMP Provost advised that the offender was already discharged from the courthouse and mentioned that the offender stated he was going to the RPCC to retrieve his personal effects.
- Admitting staff contacted the Property office at the RPCC to detain inmate [redacted] if he arrived to retrieve his personal property.
- Inmate [redacted] did not attend the property office at RPCC and was declared unlawfully-at-large on Corrections Management Information System at 6:11 p.m.

- The RCMP were notified on Thursday morning, October 23, 2008 that inmate [redacted] was unlawfully-at-large.
- Inmate [redacted] remains at large at this time.

# Appendix 4

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: **REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES** | | Page 1 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this policy is to provide procedures for the reporting of serious incidents in correctional facilities.

**DEFINITIONS**

Correctional Facility - means a correctional centre or a community correctional facility.

Community Correctional Facility - means a facility designated by the Minister to house inmates in reduced custody or to provide a correctional service or program, and includes:

- Community-Training Residence
- Correctional Camps
- Community Operations

Serious Bodily Harm - refers to an injury to staff or inmates that is likely to endanger life.

Serious Incidents - Serious incidents include, but not restricted to the following:

- Riots/Major Disturbances (an incident that greatly disrupts the daily activities of an institution)
- Escapes from secure custody
- Escapes from high security escorts
- Incidents from Community Correctional Facilities involving offenders which are assessed as serious in nature (sexual assault, homicide, armed robbery and/or any incident that draws significant media attention)
- Inmate death
- Suicide
  - Attempted suicide resulting in serious bodily harm (hospitalization, serious blood spill, etc.)
- Hostage taking
- Serious bodily harm to staff or inmate
- Fire and natural disasters (causing extensive damage or disruption)
- Any other incident which, by its nature, could or has attracted media attention.

SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY
CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY

| TOPIC: REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES | | Page 2 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | *AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections* | |

All other incidents will be reviewed by the on-call manager or facility director to determine the seriousness of the incident and the urgency to report immediately to the Executive Director of Corrections.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

1.0 Reporting

1.1 Every correctional facility shall have local procedures established to ensure reporting of serious incidents to the on-call manager.

1.2 Every correctional facility will have procedures in place to manage emergent situations, which may involve protocols with local police services and the respective correctional centre.

1.3 The correctional facility Director shall ensure verbal communication is made to the Executive Director of Corrections as soon as reasonably practical regarding all serious incidents.

1.4 The correctional facility Director will determine the seriousness of incidents that are not listed in this policy and the urgency to report the incident immediately to the Executive Director of Corrections.

1.5 During normal working hours, the Executive Director of Corrections shall be contacted at Central Office. After non-working hours, contact shall be via the Executive Director of Corrections cellular phone.

1.6 Initial verbal and written reports will be completed on a standard "Incident Report" (Appendix A) and shall identify:

- Dates and times of the incident.
- Nature of the incident.
- Offender(s) involved and admission and biographical information.
- Staff involved and nature of this involvement.
- Circumstances or contributing factors to the incident.

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES | | Page 3 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

- Actions taken in response to the incident and the results.

1.7 The Notification of Escape from a Correctional Facility form (Appendix B) will be completed and electronically submitted to the local Police Service as soon as possible following an escape.

1.8 All serious incidents are to be reported to the Deputy Minister and the Minister through the Executive Director of Corrections.

2.0 Post-Incident

2.1 The correctional facility Director shall ensure critical incident de-briefing occurs with relevant personnel and offenders as necessary.

2.2 The correctional facility Director shall ensure a review and critical analysis of the incident is completed, and will implement corrective/preventative measures in consultation with the Executive Director of Corrections.

2.3 Pursuant to Section 50(1) of *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations* the Executive Director and any person appointed by the Executive Director has the authority to conduct inspections or investigations in any correctional facility.

2.4 The Executive Director of Corrections, in consultation with Justice/Corrections and Public Safety Communications Branch, shall direct arrangements for sharing of information with the media.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:**

This policy is effective as indicated.

Maureen Lloyd
Executive Director of Corrections

| Section - Number |
|---|
| *Security - 0012* |

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: **REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES** | | Page 4 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

**APPENDIX A**

**INCIDENT REPORT**
**(Correctional Facilities)**

This Incident Report must be completed by the on-duty Assistant Deputy Director/Unit Supervisor or Senior Manager or duty stand-by manager in accordance with Divisional Directive Security-0012 'Reporting of Incidents in Correctional Facilities'.

From: Senior Manager/Unit Supervisor/
Assistant Deputy Director _____
Name

To: Executive Director of Corrections

1. Nature of Incident:

2. Offender(s) Involved:

Name: _____

Date of Birth: _____

CMIS Number: _____

Current Offences: _____

_____

_____

_____

Start Date/Warrant Expiry: _____

| Section - Number |
|---|
| *Security - 0012* |

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES | | Page 5 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

Earliest Release Date: _____

INCIDENT REPORT
Page 2

3. Immediate Response/Action Taken:

4. How did the incident occur/contributing factors?

5. When did the incident occur? _____
(Date and time)

Location: _____

_____

_____

6. Was Use of Force utilized? If so, briefly describe what occurred, i.e. use of chemical agents, injuries, loss or damage to government property. Was the Emergency Response Team Assembled _____ or deployed _____?

| Section - Number |
|---|
| *Security - 0012* |

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES | | Page 6 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

INCIDENT REPORT
Page 3

7. Assessment regarding the offenders potential danger to the community.

8. Notification of victims or immediate family in the case of death or serious injury.

9. Initially, all media inquiries will be referred to the Executive Director of Corrections. If determined that media inquiries will be responded to at the local level, who is the media contact? _____
(Name of Media Contact)

cc: Director
Deputy Director (Security/Operations)
Deputy Director (Programs)

| Section - Number |
|---|
| *Security - 0012* |

**SASKATCHEWAN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**
**CORRECTIONS DIVISION POLICY**

| TOPIC: **REPORTING OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES** | | Page 7 |
|---|---|---|
| LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY:<br>Part VII, Section 51 - *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations*<br>Divisional Directives: Security – 0033 – Investigations in Correctional Facilities<br>Administration - 0003 - Operational Audits, Reviews and Investigations | EFFECTIVE DATE:<br>**January 1, 1996** | REVISED<br>**May, 2005** |
| PREPARED BY: Bob Vogelsang | AUTHORIZATION: Executive Director of Corrections | |

**APPENDIX 'B'**
**NOTIFICATION OF ESCAPE FROM A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

**DETAILS CONTAINED IN THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC IF DEEMED APPROPRIATE**

_____ **CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

**FROM:** _____ , _____
*Name (please print)* *Title (please print)*
Senior Manager, _____ Correctional Facility

**TO:** _____ Police Service, Platoon Commander
**ATTENTION:** Fax:

**RE:** **NOTIFICATION OF ESCAPE**

Date of Escape: ____ / ____ / ____ Time of Escape: _____
*Day* *Month* *Year* *Indicate A.M. or P.M.*

| Inmate(s) Involved: | Date of Birth | Remand/ Sentence | Charges | Earliest Release Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

**Details of Escape:**

_____
_____
_____
_____

**The Correctional Facilities investigating the circumstances of the escape.**
**A local media contact for the Correctional Facilities:**

_____ . _____

Name (please print) Title (please print)

| Section - Number |
|---|
| *Security - 0012* |

# Appendix 5

**REGINA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE STANDING ORDERS**

**LEADERSHIP ⇔ QUALITY ⇔ INTEGRITY ⇔ LAWFUL ⇔ PROFESSIONAL**

***"A respectful and dignified environment that through teamwork provides effective Corrections"***

| Topic: INFORMATION SHARING | | | Section: 411 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared by: G. Munro<br>Revised by: M.McFadyen | Authorization: Centre Director | Date: 08 April 2002<br>Revised: 07 Feb 2008 | Page: 1 |

**PURPOSE:**

To provide standards for the effective and consistent reporting and sharing of information between management, work units, staff and shifts.

**PRINCIPLES:**

It is the responsibility of every staff member to duly note and report in a timely manner any information and take necessary action which may impact the safety and security of the Centre, incidents observed or unusual factors associated with any inmate or program delivery.

Staff have a duty to provide complete, accurate and thorough information in all methods of reports.

**DEFINITIONS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Log Book | A permanent written record by shift of each work area\units activities maintained in a bound volume within each staff area. |
| Work Area/Unit | Any location staffed by a correctional employee intended for the direct supervision and housing of inmates. |
| Shift Briefing | A record of incidents and information of note entered into the Corrections Management Information System by the Assistant Deputy Director Security supervising that shift. (Copy placed in Main Square Trap). |
| Shift Change Information | A hand written record of the information contained in the Shift Briefing placed into a clip file in the Main Square Trap to provide for the sharing of information to employees who can not access the Corrections Management Information System. |
| Incident Log Report | A record of an incident or information of note entered into the Corrections Management Information System by a staff. |

REGINA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE STANDING ORDERS

LEADERSHIP ⇔ QUALITY ⇔ INTEGRITY ⇔ LAWFUL ⇔ PROFESSIONAL

*"A respectful and dignified environment that through teamwork provides effective Corrections"*

| Topic: INFORMATION SHARING | | | Section: 411 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared by: G. Munro<br>Revised by: M.McFadyen | Authorization: Centre Director | Date: 08 April 2002<br>Revised: 07 Feb 2008 | Page: 2 |

**CROSS REFERENCE:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Divisional Directive | Security 0012 | Reporting of Incidents in Correctional Facilities |
| | Personnel 0009 | Standards of Conduct for Corrections Workers |

**RESPONSIBILITIES:**

It is the responsibility of every staff member to duly note any unusual factors associated with any inmate or the safety and security of the Centre. Staff are required to take appropriate action by immediately reporting the matter verbally to the supervising A.D.D. (Security) or Team Leader and submitting an Incident Log Report. This would include an inmate(s) displaying ongoing or unusual behaviour such as talking to himself, evidence of despondency, failure or refusal to take meals, excessive sleeping, crying or shouting. It would additionally include observing and investigation apparent injuries which were not previously noted and seeking medical advise.

The suggestion of any apparent suicidal tendencies, including verbal statements, comments by others or suicide notes require **immediate action** including direct referral to the nurse on duty.

**STANDARDS:**

1. It is essential that information be disseminated effectively, accordingly all staff shall be responsible for reviewing, reporting and recording information by:

   - Ensuring that as soon as possible on beginning a tour of duty the log book for the area of their assignment is reviewed; and
   - All shift briefings on the C.M.I.S. (Corrections Management Information System) from their last tour of duty are reviewed; and
   - Entering all required information into log books; and
   - Reporting verbally to the shift/area supervisor any incident or information of note; and
   - Record in an Incident Log Report, in a complete and concise matter, as soon as possible and before leaving the institution.

REGINA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE STANDING ORDERS

LEADERSHIP ⇔ QUALITY ⇔ INTEGRITY ⇔ LAWFUL ⇔ PROFESSIONAL

*"A respectful and dignified environment that through teamwork provides effective Corrections"*

| Topic: INFORMATION SHARING | | | Section: 411 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared by: G. Munro<br>Revised by: M.McFadyen | Authorization: Centre Director | Date: 08 April 2002<br>Revised: 07 Feb 2008 | Page: 3 |

2. Log Book entries shall contain the following information:

   - The first entry should indicate the date, time, shift, inmate count and printed name of staff members working that work area/unit.

   - Subsequent entries shall note:

     - Record all inmate movement.
     - Any unusual inmate(s) interactions with peers and staff.
     - Identify problems encountered with program delivery, procedures and/or security.
     - Record times of unit checks as identified in unit procedures.
     - Record formal count as set out in Standing Order Security 450.
     - Document any and all unusual events.
     - Indicate inmates who have disciplinary charges and any sanctions imposed.
     - Identify new admissions, transfers, discharges, confinements and changes to inmate work placements or routines.
     - Identify inmates have been granted or denied programs (i.e. CTR, TLA's, Parole, FVU etc.).
     - Any changes in staff assignment.
     - The last entry will indicate the time, inmate count and be initialled by the staff assigned.

   *** Note: Log Books are to be reviewed and signed off daily by Unit Supervisor.**

3. Log books cannot be removed form the work area/unit without the authority of the manager for that work area/unit who must provide a replacement log book where staff will note the date time and name of the staff who removed the previous log book.

   It is a serious breach of duty to damage, alter or remove any entry or part of the log book. Any accidental damage to a log book must immediately be verbally reported and an Incident Log Report completed.

4. Log book entries are intended to immediately identify operational, security and program activities and direct staff to a more detailed and comprehensive recording contained in the Incident Log Report or Shift Briefing.

| Topic: INFORMATION SHARING | | | Section: 411 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared by: G. Munro<br>Revised by: M.McFadyen | Authorization: Centre Director | Date: 08 April 2002<br>Revised: 07 Feb 2008 | Page: 4 |

5. Incident Log Reports shall be entered under the "Offender Log" for each inmate where identities are known and will become a part of the inmate's electronic record. For incidents of an unknown or non-inmate specific nature they will be entered under the "institutional log" heading.

6. Incident Log Reports (and initial verbal report) shall identify:

   - Nature of the incident or information.
   - Dates and time of incident or information.
   - Offender(s) involved and admission and biographical information.
   - Staff and non-offenders involved including the nature of involvement.
   - Circumstances or contributing factors to the incident.
   - Actions taken in response to the incident and results or follow up action recommended.

7. It is the responsibility of the A.D.D. (Security) to complete a " Shift Change Information Briefing" Form and enter a Shift Briefing under the "Institutional Log" immediately prior to the end of the shifts tour of duty.

8. Shift Briefings shall identify:

   - Institutional count at end of shift.
   - Incidents or significant events:
     - Weapons or significant contraband found.
     - Units on confinement.
     - Offenders displaying behaviour problems.
     - Policy or procedure changes.
     - Operational or mechanical problems.
     - Offender medical concerns.
   - Any information of note.
   - Potential foreseeable problems which may occur.

REGINA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE STANDING ORDERS

LEADERSHIP ⇔ QUALITY ⇔ INTEGRITY ⇔ LAWFUL ⇔ PROFESSIONAL

*"A respectful and dignified environment that through teamwork provides effective Corrections"*

| Topic: INFORMATION SHARING | | | Section: 411 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared by: G. Munro<br>Revised by: M.McFadyen | Authorization: Centre Director | Date: 08 April 2002<br>Revised: 07 Feb 2008 | Page: 5 |

J. Hulet
Director
Regina Provincial Correctional Centre

## Appendix 6

### PURPOSE

***The intent of the interim procedures are to ensure that the Minister, the Deputy Minister, and the public through the media, are advised of threats to public safety. These procedures should be applied recognizing that situations may arise where it may not be in the interest of public safety for the Ministry to advise the public. Determination of whether or not such a situation has arisen and whether or not an exception will be made, is at the discretion of the Deputy Minister, informed by advice from police and senior corrections officials.***

- **The following:**
  - outlines the procedures to be followed for reporting serious adult and youth corrections incidents to the Deputy Minister and Minister, and;
  - defines instances where media advisories would be issued.

### AUTHORITY

- The reporting of serious incidents is addressed in:
  - Adult Corrections Security Policy – 0012 for incidents that occur in correctional facilities
  - Adult Corrections Community Operations – Administration – 06 – for the reporting of serious incidents involving offenders under conditional sentence, probation or bail supervision
  - Young Offender Programs Custody Policy and Procedures Manual Chapter 7 Section 1 for incidents that occur in young offender custody facilities
  - Section 110 of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) protects the privacy of young persons. Publication to protect the safety of individuals and the community can occur in two ways:
    - The youth court can order publication of identifying information if there is reason to believe that the young person poses a danger to others and publication of the information will assist in his/her apprehension. The legislation requires application by a peace officer.
    - The youth court may release information on conviction of a serious personal injury offence if risk of serious harm exists and disclosure will assist in avoiding the harm.

- The authority for reviews/investigations of incidents is addressed in:
  - Part VII, Section 50(1) of *The Correctional Services Act*
  - Adult Corrections Administration Policy – 0003
  - Young Offender Programs Custody Policy and Procedures Manual, Chapter 7 Section 1
  - Young Offender Programs Policy and Procedures Manual Chapter 10 Section 1, Youth Death Policy.

**REPORTING AND NOTIFICATION:**

**Level 1 - Threats to Public Safety**
- **Require Immediate Notification**
- **Issuance of a Media Advisory**

***Incidents:***

Adult Corrections (only)

- Escapes, releases in error and/or when an inmate that may pose a threat to public safety is unlawfully at large for any reason from adult secure custody facilities (Regina Provincial Correctional Centre, Saskatoon Provincial Correctional Centre, Prince Albert Provincial Correctional Centre and Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre).

***Process:***

- Step 1 – The Senior Official responsible for the adult facility will immediately report to the appropriate police service(s). Thereafter, the Senior Official responsible for the adult facility will immediately contact the on-call Executive Director by telephone.

- Step 2 – The on-call Executive Director will immediately contact the Deputy Minister and the on-call Director of Communications by telephone. (NOTE: All references to the Deputy Minister in the remainder of this memorandum apply to the Deputy Minister's Designate if the Deputy Minister is unavailable or unable to act for any reason).

    - Upon being notified by the on-call Executive Director, the Deputy Minister will immediately contact the Minister's Chief of Staff by telephone.
    - If the Deputy Minister is unable to contact the Minister's Chief of Staff, the Deputy Minister will immediately contact the Minister by telephone.

        - If the on-call Executive Director is unable to contact the Deputy Minister, the on-call Executive Director will immediately contact the Minister's Chief of Staff by telephone.
            - If the on-call Executive Director is unable to contact the Minister's Chief of Staff, the on-call Executive Director will immediately contact the Minister by telephone.

    - After contacting the Minister's Chief of Staff, or the Minister if the circumstances require, the Executive Director will immediately contact the officer in charge of the relevant police service(s) to advise that a media advisory is being prepared to warn the public about the incident.
        - If the police service objects to the issuance of a Media Advisory due to exceptional operational issues that could prejudice ongoing investigations or endanger members of the public who are uniquely at risk as a result of the Level 1 incident, the Deputy Minister shall consider whether such issues outweigh the immediate and pressing need to notify the public as soon as possible and decide if an exception is to be made.

- If the Deputy Minister determines that an exception to the issuance of a Media Advisory should be made, the Deputy Minister will advise the Minister immediately.

- Step 3 – As soon as operationally possible, an Incident Report will be prepared by the Senior Official at the adult facility and forwarded to the on-call Executive Director, the on-call Director of Communications and the Deputy Minister's Office by e-mail.
- Step 4 – The on-call Executive Director will as soon as possible prepare and provide the Minister's Office, Deputy Minister's Office, and the on-call Director of Communications a fact sheet based on the contents of the Incident Report.
- Step 5 – Concurrently with the preparation of the fact sheet, the on-call Director of Communications will prepare a Media Advisory. It will immediately be circulated to the Deputy Minister's Office, Minister's Office and Executive Council upon completion. Upon receiving confirmation from the Minister's office or Executive Council that the Media Advisory can be released, it will be provided to media outlets immediately.

    - In the event that including the identity of the individual(s) at large in the Media Advisory would delay its provision to media outlets, the Media Advisory will simply list the number of individual(s) that are at large from the adult secure correctional facility, with a second Media Advisory containing the identity of the individual(s) to follow as soon as that information can be released.

---

**Level 2 – Serious Incidents – No Immediate Threat to Public Safety**

- **Require Immediate Notification**
- **No Immediate Media Advisory**

---

***Incidents:***

Adult Corrections Custody Programs

- Attempted escapes from secure custody.
- Adult Inmates who do not pose a threat to public safety who are unlawfully at large for any reason.

Young Offender Secure Custody Programs

- Escapes/attempted escapes.
- Releases in error and/or youth who are unlawfully at large for any reason from young offender secure custody.

***Process:***

- Step 1 – The Senior Official responsible for the adult or youth facility will immediately:
    - Report the matter to the appropriate police service; and
    - Contact the on-call Executive Director by telephone.
- Step 2 – The on-call Executive Director contacts:
    - The Deputy Minister and the Director of Communications by telephone.
        - If the on-call Executive Director is unable to contact the Deputy Minister, the on-call Executive Director will contact the Minister's Chief of Staff by telephone.

    - If the on-call Executive Director is unable to contact the Minister's Chief of Staff, the on-call Executive Director will contact the Minister by telephone.
- Step 3 – An Incident Report will be prepared by the Senior Official at the adult or youth facility and forwarded to the on-call Executive Director, the Director of Communications, and the Deputy Minister's Office by e-mail.
- Step 4 – The on-call Executive Director will provide the Minister's Office, Deputy Minister's Office, and Director of Communications with a 1 page fact sheet based on the contents of the Incident Report as soon as possible.
- An immediate Media Advisory will not be issued. A Media Advisory may be issued, if circumstances warrant, at a later time for reasons of public safety or to assist in the apprehension of the offender. In the case of Young Offenders, identification of a young offender is prohibited under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* except where authorized by a Youth Court Judge.

---

**Level 3 – Incidents – Low risk to Public Safety**

- **Require Weekly Notification**
- **No Media Advisory**

---

***Incidents:***

Adult Corrections and Young Offender Programs

- Unlawfully at larges and escapes from community training residences, community correctional centres, urban camps, open custody and those who tamper with electronic monitoring bracelets.
- Individuals sentenced to intermittent custody (i.e. live at home all week and spend weekends in custody) who do not show up for custody on the weekend.

***Process:***

- Step 1 – The Executive Directors of Corrections and Young Offender Programs will provide a weekly report to the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister and the Director of Communications.
- Step 2 – The Deputy Minister's Office will provide the report to the Minister's Office.
- Step 3 – No Media Advisory will be issued.

**MEDIA INQUIRIES:**

---

- In all cases, media inquiries are to be forwarded to the Ministry's Communications Branch Director.
- Communications, in consultation with the affected branch and the Deputy Minister's Office, will determine if a response is necessary and who the most appropriate spokesperson will be.
- The Minister's Office will be advised of all media inquiries by the Director of Communications, and will be consulted with regarding the most appropriate spokesperson and messaging for a response.